Previous references.

(440-07)-8

1909

(Municipal)

File No 21—8

Serial Nos. 3—4

Later references

Sanj 17 (2) Vol 2, 3, 4

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 3—4

Part B for July 1909

SUBJECT.

Sanitary Improvement Scheme of the Improvement Trust Bd

from the Sanj. Comr no 4035 of 25.3.09 forwg Govt order dtd 5.3.09, "that the last two months' subscription should be collected by the Improvement Trust Bd" & should be followed in the case of the Improvement Trust Bd also, seeking reconsideration of the above order

do to do, Chief Engr Chairman, Trust Bd, & Comptr.

no. 4035 dtd 21-5 & 2-7-09

approving of the Sanj. Comr's suggestion relating to certain modification in the procedure to be followed in dealing with proposals of Improvement Trust Bd & the Comptr and by the Bd of Trustees & directing the withdrawal of para 1(c) of G.O. of 29.9.08 in the matter

G.R.S. 38

[illegible]

[illegible].11] 1908-09

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Rul)

NOTES

File No 211-08

FILE HEADING

[illegible]nitary Improvement Schemes of the Mysore City Improvement Trust Board

From

The Secy Commr

No 4035 Dated 25-3-09 Received 27-3-09

Diary No 6824	Enclos	Spare Copies	Serial No 3

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

States with refce to Go. No 8015-6/Rul 211-08-28 8 3 09 that the principle "that the last word on a sanitary subject should be had by the Sanitary Authority, should be followed in the case of the Mysore City Impt Trust Board works and that felt incon[illegible] should not be allowed to outweigh fundamental principles and requ[illegible] a reconsideration of the above Govt Order

NOTES AND ORDERS

The Secy Commr thinks that the procedure recommended ~~suggested~~ by him in St No 1 is better than the one sanctioned in the above G.O. He also thinks that the P.W.S often do not care much for the sanitary aspect of a ~~work~~ project

Notes—First sheet

GPB— 0000—3 1 07

Serial No.

project and that consequently much money will have to be spent in altering such projects. As an example of such a project he mentions the "Clarke's Lines in Rangoon".

2 Submitted for orders. The Advocate General's contention is not without force

1st Cr. 3.4.09

3 It will be of advantage if the Sanitary Commissioner see the Chief Engineer's note of 11.1.09 in file No 211-08 and he may perhaps waive the objection now put forward. The point is, the Chief Engineer does not alter the sanitary portion of the project, but may alter the Engineering details if necessary. The integrity of the project as approved by the Sanitary Board will not be interfered with

6/4/09

Note—Contin. sheet.

C17D—50,000—15-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Ind File No. 211 of 1908

3

Serial No.	
No 141 of 15/4/09	Forwarded unofficially to the Chief Engr for favour of opinion.
8 16-4-09	By order K. Meyhar Rao for Secretary.
C No. 73 of 15/4/09	I am still of opinion that the procedure previously advocated by me in my Note of 11-1-09 (to the Govt) I do not alter, or propose to alter, as Chief Engineer, the Sanitary features of "Sanitary projects" passed by the Sanitary Board, but only (such) Engineering details as may be considered necessary when carrying out the work. (2) The "Clerks' Quarters at Madura" were built on the same design as Quarters constructed elsewhere: these cannot be considered a "Sanitary Project in any sense of the word: & were sanctioned before any Sanitary Board was in existence at all. Such buildings were not designed to admit of fresh air & light: the rooms had no arrangements (in the latter case) made for letting out smoke, which I am informed is the cause or chief cause of complaint. Plans & Estimates for Quarters are not sent to Sanitary Board for approval, nor do I consider it necessary that they should be sent.
W 4 [illegible]	
Let orders have been issued to Supdg Engineer to provide wall cases for the escape of smoke from kitchens	

Bangalore
21 [illegible]

[illegible]
Chief Engineer
of Mysore.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—12-5-08

[illegible]

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat

MYSORE HEALTH OFFICER
8 MAY 1909

File No. 211 of 1908

Serial

COMMISSIONER TO GOVT

6

Submitted with the Chief Engineer's unofficial officium

Chief Engr } May this be forwarded to the Sanitary Commr
Secy } 26-4-09 Illegible

This file may be forwarded (to) the Sany Commr for perusal of the C. Engr's u-o note in this file. A copy of the C. Engr's u-o note in file 211-08 may also be sent to him

Illegible

CHB
26/4/09

35
27.4.09

9 H/CS Illegible
27/4/09

Jamil
28.4

-8 No 153 of 1908
S 30-4 of

10 Forwarded (in official) to the Sanitary Commr for perusal of the notes prepared to me this above

H. Muyalarao
Assistant Secretary

S 28/4/09

11 The Chief Engineer's unofficial note 211/09
The first para thereof having been written under a misapprehension of my meaning should be further referred to

In regard to the Sanitary matter I do not think the Chief Engineer is differing very widely. The note in his own handwriting on file 15-4-09 says that the only alteration

13/5/09

No 24
14 MAY 1909

Note—Contin. sheet

OPB—30,000—15-5-08

alleged to be made are such as he may consider necessary after the proper

Serial No.

realisation of the object of the project when carrying out the work

A

I must say that such 'details' - details which no man can foresee or test even with any personal at all when I wrote my letter No 25 of 25.3.09, or my No 1845 of 9.11.08. My own words are "the only thing that matters is that after final approval by the Govt's Board no alteration whatever should be made but the matter is placed before Govt for such orders as they may be pleased to make" - From which it is clear that I was not entitled to interfere with the subject action of the Chief Engineer in making structural modifications when carrying out the work

B

It was the scrutiny & check by the Chief Engineer after the project had been before the Sanctioning Board & passed by them that assured to me the such scrutiny & check & open to objection (vide G.O. 331-S of 29 Sept 08 Para 2 (subpara 1). Such scrutiny & check might involve alterations in design details of design - at least so it appears to me

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

24

In the light of answers of the Chief Engineer remarks - (note of 15-6-05) I am prepared to modify my proposal.

I gather from them now that the proposed alteration in the plans and details of a project which has been approved by the Central Sanitary Board, before it is submitted for sanction, but only to alter such engineering details as may be considered necessary when carrying out the work.

Further I raise no objection at all -

25

But the 'Secretary's Check' referred to in the 20 are all important, only it should take place before the project comes before the C.S.B. The function of the C.S.B is not merely to say that a filter or a drain there or a block of flats etc. would be a good thing from a Sanitary point of view it is their business to see that the filter, or drain etc. is on a proper design & of material which will really effect the object in view. Therefore when a project is to come before the Board it should be as complete as possible, fully [illegible] & checked by the Engineering Experts.

NOTE—Contin. sheet.

Mr 24-08

6 Para 2 subpara ought then to read as follows

That all unopened projects sent up by the Board of Trustees should be carefully considered & checked by the Chief Engineer in respect of their Engineering features & then placed before the Sanitary Board for approval After approval they should be forwarded by Govt for sanction (direct or through Chief Engineer as not important from a sanitary point of view)

7 Subpara iii seems unnecessary As the project which came before the Central Sanitary Board they will have no opportunity of proposing modifications & now is it desirable that they should interfere when the matter was again referred to them by Govt.

8 The Chief Engineer does not think that a block of public residential buildings can, in any case, be considered a Sanitary Project. Now if there is one thing more than another that comes within the provisions of the Sanitation it is dwellings And, in the case of public dwellings, where the inhabitants of houses have to occupy them,

Can have no say in the matter of
their construction, it appears true
that such structures are eminently of
a nature to demand that Govt should
have the advice of the Board of the
Coal came within that landmark
& Govt as entitling the scheme to
Consideration of that Board

Q4 Quite true in the case of the underground
Clerks Quarters, instructions have been
given to make arrangements, ~~to provide~~
~~out the smoke~~ for the escape of the
smoke from the Kitchens We we all
know what such 'provision' would mean
it would mean the totally inadequate provision of
open ventilating tiles in the roof What is
wanted is an arrangement that will
cause a proper draught by which the
smoke will be extracted from the rooms
Consider what the cost of the alterations
will be in addition to the cost of the
Means of a Caretaker have been quoted
a much less expenditure would have been
found necessary I can fancy that removing
Concrete and rebuilding would be the Construction
of Efficient flues.

20 The chief engineer writes me from time to time a list of cases in which suspected have remained insanitary though family engineers called. I can not bring back a list but in such instances to the supply will be mine. I shall not quote dwellings though there are many "sanitary progress" - I shall simply refer to the flooring of the valve house at the filter beds supplying Bangalore city. The floor over the filter beds is apparently away of the city yet it is made of loose planks through which the dirt from outside finds easy access to the filter beds. No sanitary engineer has sanctioned such an arrangement. - yet the engineer must have considered of small importance, as pointed in the above fine book, carrying into execution the ideas of the foremost sanitarians of the day, as stated by them on family oath*

13.5.09

* There are other family details on Watkins plan. but I could not afford one.

DEPT OF PUBLIC HEALTH IN MYSORE
BANGALORE
8 - MAY 1909
SANITARY COMMISSIONER TO GOVT

Chief Engineer's note 9 11 1.09 ml 2442 (Page 2)

The contention of the Sanitary Commissioner appears to be that Engineers are not apparently experts in sanitation, or that they are at any rate indifferent to - - points of sanitation which sanitarians would consider of vital importance I beg to differ entirely from the Sanitary Commissioner's opinion , for every "Sanitary Engineer" is a Sanitarian, and is a greater expert in matters connected with the requirements of sanitation than so called sanitarians without any training or experiance in Sanitary Engineering

I quite agree , however, that all differences of opinion between the Chief Engineer and the Sanitary Board should, and can be settled by unofficial notes or personal discussion

I cannot agree that after all points in respect of a project have once been settled and agreed to by the Sanitary Board, it is necessary to refer to the any further The Chief Engineer is responsible for the carrying out of the project in accordance with the designs which have been placed before the Board and approved after their scrutiny and discussion, and it would be a mere of time to submit a project to that Board again

In case of "revision" on any lines agreed to by the Sanitary Board, such projects will necessarily be sent back to the Board after such revision for their approval, as always has been done so far as I know As I said before in respect to projects which having been already approved of by the Sanitary Board, whether original or revised, it would be absolutely a waste of time to send it to them again So far as Engineering details are concerned, it would be perfectly useless to send the project back for them to discuss or criticize such details as the Chief Engineer might consider necessary to alter as he is after all the only expert on the Board capable of judging the necessity or advisability of such modifications as he considers necessary in the carrying out of works Even many of the greatest experts in Sanitary Engineering in the world have differences of opinion in many details In regard to the remark of the Sanitary Commissioner that he could refer to many projects passed by the Chief Engineer which are insanitary owing to faulty engineering details (presumably details not already passed by the Sanitary Board themselves and which the Chief Engineer altered or modified without their consent) I should be obliged if the Sanitary Commissioner would send me a list of these, when probably I

In case of "revision" on any lines agreed to by the Sanitary Board, such projects will necessarily be sent back to the Board after such revision for their approval, as always has been done so far as I know As I said before in respect to projects which having been already approved of by the Sanitary Board, whether original or revised, it would be absolutely a waste of time to send it to them again So far as Engineering details are concerned, it would be perfectly useless to send the project back for them to discuss or criticize such details as the Chief Engineer might consider necessary to alter as he is after all the only expert on the Board capable of judging the necessity or advisability of such modifications as he considers necessary in the carrying out of works Even many of the greatest experts in Sanitary Engineering in the world have differences of opinion in many details In regard to the remark of the Sanitary Commissioner that he could refer to many projects passed by the Chief Engineer which are insanitary owing to faulty engineering details (presumably details not already passed by the Sanitary Board themselves, and which the Chief Engineer altered or modified without their consent) I should be obliged if the Sanitary Commissioner would send me a list of these, when probably I

12

I would be able to give some explanation in regard to them.

Copy

A V

K. Nityanand Rao
for Secretary to Govt
Agl

12

The Sanitary Commissioner's un-official note dated the 14th May 1909.

---

11 "The Chief Engineer's unofficial note of the 11th January 1909.

The first para thereof having been written under a clear misapprehension of my meaning need not be further referred to.

In regard to the essential matter, I don't think the Chief Engineer and I differ very widely. The note in his own handwriting over date 15-4-1909 says that the only alterations likely to be made are such as he may consider necessary for the -- proper realisation of the object of the project when carrying out the work.

12 I need hardly say that such details - details which no man can foresee- did not come within my purview at all, when I wrote my letter No. 4025 dated the 25th March 1909, and my No. 1845 dated the 9th November 1908. My very words are " the only thing that matters is that after final approval by the Central Sanitary Board no alteration whatever shall be made, till the matter is placed before Government for such orders as they may be pleased to make."

From which it is clear there was no intention to interfere with the expert action of the Chief Engineer in making structural modifications when carrying out the work.

13 It was

44

18 It was the scrutiny and check by the Chief Engineer after the project had been before the Sanitary Board and passed by them that seemed to me to be open to objection (vide No. 3511-5 of the 29th September 1908 para 2 -sub para ii). Such scrutiny and check might involve alteration in details of design - at least so it appeared to me.

14 In the light, however, of the Chief Engineer's remarks -- (note of the 15th April 1909) I am prepared to modify my proposal.

I gather from him now that he proposes to make no alteration in the plans and details of a project after it has been approved by the Central Sanitary Board, and before it is submitted to Government for sanction, but only to "alter such engineering details as may be considered necessary when carrying out the work". To this I raise no objection at all.

15 But "the scrutiny and check" referred to in the Government order is all important, only it should take place before the project comes before the Central Sanitary Board. The function of the Central Sanitary Board is not merely to say that a filter here or a drain there or a block of official headquarters would be a good thing from a sanitary point of view it is their business to see that the filter or drain &c is of a design and of a material which will really effect the object in view. Therefore when a project

15

project is to come before the Board it should be as complete as possible, fully scrutinized and checked by the Engineering experts.

16 Para 2 Sub para ii ought thus to read as follows -

That all new and revised projects sent up by the Board of Trustees should be carefully scrutinized and checked by the -- Chief Engineer in respect of their Engineering features and then placed before the Central Sanitary Board for approval. After approval they should be forwarded to Government for sanction (direct or through Chief Engineer is not important from a sanitary point of view).

17 Sub para iii seems unnecessary. As the project will not again come before the Central Sanitary Board, they will have no opportunity of proposing modifications nor is it ~~advisable~~ desirable that they should interfere, unless the matter were again referred to them by Government.

18 The Chief Engineer does not think that a block of public residential buildings can, in any sense, be considered a sanitary project. Now, if there is one thing more than another that comes within the purview of the sanitarian, it is "dwellings" and in the case of public dwellings, where the individuals who will --- have to occupy them, can have no say in the matter of their construction, it appears to me that such structures are eminently

of

of a nature to demand that Government should have the advice of the Central Sanitary Board, if the cost came within that laid down by Government as entitling the scheme to ~~a~~ be considered by that Board

19 I note that in the case of the Bangalore clerks' quarters & instructions have been given to make arrangements to provide for the escape of the smoke from the kitchens Now we all know what such provision usually means - it means the ~~total~~ totally inadequate provision of a few ventilating tiles in the roof What is wanted is an arrangement that will cause a proper draught by which the smoke will be extracted from the residence Consider what the cost of this alteration will be in armoured concrete roofed houses ! Whereas if a sanitarian had been consulted at first a much less expenditure would have been found necessary I can fancy that armoured concrete could well lend itself to the construction of efficient flues

20 The Chief Engineer invites me to give him a list of cases in which sanitary projects have remained insanitary through -- faulty engineering details I have no time to make a list but one single instance will suffice to illustrate my meaning I shall not quote dwellings though they are eminently "sanitary projects" I shall simply refer to the flooring of the valve house at the filter beds supplying Bangalore City This floor

17

floor covers the filtered water as it passes away to the city

Yet it is made of loose planks through which the dirt from visitors' feet finds easy access to the filtered water. No sanitarian could have sanctioned such an arrangement. Yet the Engineer must have considered it of small importance, and his otherwise fine work, carrying into execution the ideas of the foremost sanitarians of the day, is spoiled by this one faulty detail. There are other faulty details in that same place, but I said I would only give one

(Signed) John Smyth
13 5 09

G.I.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 211 of 1908

Serial No.

21 File submitted for orders with the Sanitary Commissioners' note of opinion.

22 (Office - Please put up a typed copy of Col: Smyth's unofficial note).

23 The San: Commissioner suggests a modification of para 2 (ii) of the Govt Order dated 29th Sep 1908, so that the project may come up before the Central San: Board after it is scrutinized and checked by the Chief Engineer in respect of the engineering features. The San. Comr further suggests that para 2 (iii) is unnecessary and may be omitted. Para 2 (iii) may remain. It may be considered whether para 2 (ii) may not be modified as suggested

Secy) 2 6 09 WWD

24 The modification of rule (ii) suggested by Col Smyth seems reasonable The project after scrutiny by the Sanitary Board may be submitted to Govt through the Chief Engineer

CSK 9/6/09

Note:—Under-lined

(A.E.C.)

Serial No.

189
11.6.09

The point at issue has been fully discussed by the Chief Engineer & the Sanitary Commissioner. The proposed modification of Rule 2(ii) as follows may be adopted

"That all new or revised projects sent up by the Board of Trustees should be carefully scrutinized & checked by the Chief Engr. in respect of their engineering features and then placed before the Central Sanitary Board for approval & after approval they should be forwarded to Government for sanction through the Chief Engineer.

Sub-para 2 iii may be allowed to stand.

BM

DC

11/6/09

1151
13-6-09
26

UPL—50,000—12-5-08

I agree with the proposed Committee of the Board of Trustees

BASU 58/9/16

L. Graves
Sec. to Govt.

11-6-09

Mr. Gibbons

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 24 of 190 9

6824/09

Serial No

27 Please put up draft
19-6-09
Draft submitted. It does not seem
necessary/ necessary that this should
21/6/09 be submitted to the Highness
Secy. 24.6.09
* I think so also.

The draft is submitted for approval

24/6/09

24/6/09

Approved 24/6

28/6/09

Issue

28 6

4 S.O No 21-V 2.7.09

Agrees with the Fam. Com.'s that the Chief Engineer's recording a check report in para 2(i) of the order of 26th April should take place before the project comes before the Central Famine Board and directs the modification of the said order accordingly.—

Name—Contin. sheet.

GPB—28,000—18-5-08

D 6824

No. 4025
Enc. nil

SANITARY COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, Dated the 25-3-1909

From

Lt.Col.John Smyth, M.D., I.M.S.,
Sanitary Commissioner to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE

13129

To

K.S.Chandrasekhara Iyer Esq, B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments,
BANGALORE

Sir,

ml 211-08
Sl-3

Adverting to Govt. Pro. No. 8715-6 Ml.211-08-2 dated the 8th Instant, I have the honor to state that the procedure recommended by me in my letter No. 1845 of the 2nd November 08 might involve some slight delay But this would be better than having to spend a lot a money in altering a project that had been started on insanitary lines. For example, no sanitarian would have passed the clerks' houses in Mudigere,- but an engineer passes them- even designs them without hesitation, & now money will have to be spent in altering them, much of which might have been saved if the error had been corrected at the beginning.

2. In deciding these matters, I would respectfully submit that <u>what has to be got hold of is a principle</u>, and the principle here is that the last word on a sanitary project should be had by the sanitary authority. A petty inconvenience should not outweigh or set aside a fundamental principle. It is only by rigorous adhesion to principles that things can be set straight in sanitary as other matters.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Sanitary Commissioner

Department of Public Health in Mysore.

190 —o

From

The Sanitary Comissioner,
to the Government of Mysore,
Bangalor

To

The Secretary to the Govt of H H the
Maharaja of Mysore, Gen & Rev Depts.
Bangalor

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No

Enclosure No

G.J.S. 28]

File No 21-08
Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to 6826

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT
(Genl.)

Q , the 21. 6. 1909

Date of issue 21-6-09.

Signed by

READ—

Govt Proga No 3311-5 Genl 460-07-5 dated the 29th September 1908 prescribing the procedure to be followed in submitting proposals of improvement works to be carried out by the Boards of Trustees for the Improvement of the City of Mysore.

2) Correspondence ending with letter No 2025 dated the 25th March 1909 from the Sanitary Comr with the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, [illegible]

SUBJECT

that the orders cited above constitute the Chief Engineers ~~matters~~ (and not the Central Sanitary Board) as the final arbiter of Govt on Sanitary works, and suggesting that it may be so modified as to admit of the last word on a sanitary project being left to the Sanitary Authority

suggesting certain modifications in the rules referred to

---

orders hereon. 21-5-mts 11-08

92-1-09.

On a careful consideration of all the aspects of the question, Govt agree with the Sanitary Comr that the Chief Engineers certificate & Check referred to in para 2 (ii) of the aforesaid order should take place before the project comes before the Central Sanitary Board, and direct that the said para be modified as follows:-

W.C. 211-08 (3)

G.R.S 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Continuation Sheet Draft form.)

follows:—

"That all new or
"revised proposals which are
"by the Board of Trustees should
"be carefully scrutinized and
"checked by the Chief Engineer
"in respect of their Engineering
"features and then placed
"before the Central Sanitary
"Board for approval. After
"approval they should be
"forwarded to Government
"for sanction through the
"Chief Engineer"

Perused

Yes

Sanction

27.11.07

To,

The Law Commr
" Chief Engr
" Chairman of the Bd
of Trustees for the Improvement
of the City of Bangalore
" Presidency Magistrate City Sub,
Commr
" Comptroller

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Local Fund and Sanitary (Municipal), dated 2nd July 1909

READ—

1 Government Proceedings No. 3311 5—Ml 440-07-5, dated the 29th September 1908 prescribing the procedure to be followed in submitting projects of improvement works to be carried out by the Board of Trustees for the Improvement of the City of Mysore.

2 Correspondence ending with letter No. 4025, dated the 25th March 1909 from the Sanitary Commissioner with the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, suggesting certain modifications in rules referred to.

No 21-5—Ml. 211-08-4, dated Bangalore, 2nd July 1909

Order thereon —On a careful consideration of all the aspects of the question Government agree with the Sanitary Commissioner that the Chief Engineer's scrutiny and check referred to in para 2 (ii) of the aforesaid Order, should take place before the project comes before the Central Sanitary Board, and direct that the said para be modified as follows —

"That all new or revised projects sent up by the Board of Trustees should be carefully scrutinized and checked by the Chief Engineer in respect of their Engineering features and then placed before the Central Sanitary Board for approval After approval, they should be forwarded to Government for sanction through the Chief Engineer"

C S BALASUNDARAM IYER,
Offg Secy to Govt, Gen. & Rev Depts.

To —The Sanitary Commissioner with the Government of Mysore.
The Chief Engineer of Mysore.
The Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the Improvement of the City of Mysore.
The President, Mysore City Municipal Council.
The Comptroller in Mysore.

Exd.—